REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

The Office Action indicated that claims 5-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-22 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 10/025,906 (Park et al.).

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,365,284).

Claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,365,284) in view of prior art Figs. 2 and 3, cited by Applicants.

Claims 12, 15, 17, 20, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,365,284) in view of prior art Figs. 2 and 3, cited by Applicants and further in view of Taguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,317).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 11 and 12 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 1 and 4 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 2 has been amended into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of previous claim 1. Claim 3 has been amended into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of previous claim 1. No new matter has been added. Claim 5 has been amended into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of previous claims 1 and 4. Claim 6 has been amended into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of previous claims 1 and 4. Claim 7 has been amended into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of previous claims 1 and 4. Claim 8 has been amended into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of previous claims 1 and 4. Claim 9 has been amended into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of previous claims 1 and 4. Claim 10 has been amended into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of previous claims 1 and 4. Accordingly, claims 2, 3 and 5-22 are pending for consideration.

The Claims Do Not Contain Objectionable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 5-10, objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In

accordance with this indication, claims 5-10 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 1 and 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5-10, as amended, are in prima-facie condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, the Office Action indicated that the terminology of "the current frame" and "the next frame" do not have proper antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendment addresses this concern with the amendments of "a ~~the~~ current frame" and "a ~~the~~ next frame." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection should be withdrawn.

Provisional Obviousness-type Double Patenting Rejection

In accordance with MPEP 804.I.B, if the provisional double patent rejection in one application is the only rejection remaining that application, the Examiner should then withdraw the rejection and permit the application to issue as a patent. Thus, Applicants respectfully request deferral of this matter until this application or a corresponding application issues as a patent.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,365,284). To the extent that this rejection is considered to apply to independent claim 11, as amended, the rejection is respectfully traversed as being based upon a reference that neither anticipates nor suggests the novel combination of features now recited in independent claim 11. For example, claim 11 now recites, amongst other features, "displaying a first picture on a liquid crystal display panel in a current frame; displaying a specific dummy picture on the liquid crystal display panel on which said first picture has been displayed; and displaying a second picture over said specific dummy picture in a next frame."

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no description in Matsumoto et al. with regard to displaying a specific dummy picture, much less displaying a dummy picture after displaying a first picture and before displaying a second picture. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 11, and hence dependent claim 12, all recite a novel combination of features that are neither anticipated nor suggested by Matsumoto et al. Accordingly, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,365,284) in view of prior art

Figs. 2 and 3, cited by Applicants. To the extent that this rejection is considered to still apply to independent claims 2 and 3, as amended, the rejection is respectfully traversed as being based upon a reference that neither anticipates nor suggests the novel combination of features now recited in independent claims 2 and 3. For example, claims 2 and 3 now recites a method that, amongst other features, "supplies a black data to the data lines."

Matsumoto et al. teaches compressing original video signals and then adding interpolating signals to generate pseudo video signals. The Examiner asserts at page 5 of the Office Action that the interpolating signals is like the "black data" recited in claims 2 and 3, as amended. Applicants respectfully submit that FIG. 2B of Matsumoto et al. clearly shows the interpolating signals to be compressed copies of the original video signals. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that there is no description of black data in Matsumoto et al. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that there are no signals in Matsumoto et al. that can be construed to be black data. The alleged prior art does not remedy the deficiencies of Matsumoto et al. since there is no description of black data in the alleged prior art. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 2 and 3, all recite a novel combination of features that are neither anticipated nor suggested by Matsumoto et al. and the alleged admitted prior art, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 3 be withdrawn.

To the extent that this rejection is considered to still apply to independent claim 13, the rejection is respectfully traversed as being based upon a reference that neither anticipates nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in independent claim

13. More specifically, none of the cited references, including Matsumoto et al. and the alleged admitted prior art, teaches or suggests a novel combination of elements including the features that "when a gate output enable signal is in an enabling state, the output of the scanning signal to the gate lines belonging to the corresponding group is enabled, and when a gate output enable signal is in a disable state, the output of the scanning signal to the gate lines belonging to the corresponding group is disabled, and wherein in one cycle of the clock signal, the gate driver generates a scanning pulse for a pair of gate lines that belong to different groups and processes the scanning pulse generated for the pair of gate lines with the corresponding gate output enable signals so as to divide the scanning pulse to two sequential pulses, the gate driver supplying one of the two sequential pulses to one of the pair of the gate lines and supplying the other one of the two sequential pulses to the other one of the pair of the gate lines," as recited in claim 13. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner specifically point out at least these features in Matsumoto et al. and/or the alleged admitted prior art, if the this rejection is maintained. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 13, and hence dependent claims 14-17, recite a novel combination of features that are neither anticipated nor suggested by Matsumoto et al and the alleged admitted prior art, either separately or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 13-17 be withdrawn.

To the extent that this rejection is considered to still apply to independent claim 18, the rejection is respectfully traversed as being based upon references that neither anticipates nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in independent claim

18. More specifically, none of the cited references, including Matsumoto et al. and the alleged admitted prior art, teaches or suggests a novel combination of elements including "(a) selecting two gate lines that are separated by a predetermined number of gate lines; (b) providing picture signals to a row of pixels corresponding to one of the two selected gate lines; (c) providing a reference signal to a row of pixels corresponding to the other one of the two selected gate lines; (d) repeating steps (a) through (c) for different pairs of gate lines so that all rows of pixels are refreshed by corresponding picture signals in one frame," as recited in claim 18. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner specifically point out at least these features in Matsumoto et al. and/or the alleged admitted prior art, if the this rejection is maintained. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 18, and hence dependent claims 19-22, recite a novel combination of features that are neither anticipated nor suggested by Matsumoto et al. and the alleged admitted prior art, either separately or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 18-22 be withdrawn.

Claims 12, 15, 17, 20, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,365,284) in view of prior art Figs. 2 and 3, cited by Applicants and further in view of Taguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,317). To the extent that the Examiner may consider these rejections to still apply, Applicants respectfully assert that Taguchi et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Matsumoto et al. and the alleged admitted prior art as discussed above with regard to

independent claims 11 and 18. Accordingly, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 12, 15, 17, 20 and 22 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at 202.739.5271 to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.1 36(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Masao Yoshimura
Reg. No. 52,526

Dated: March 26, 2004

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001